

**REMARKS**

**INTRODUCTION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 12, 16, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**ENTRY OF RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.116:**

Applicant requests entry of this Rule 116 Response and Request for Reconsideration because:

(a) it is believed that the amendments of claims 1, 12, 16, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 put this application into condition for allowance;

(b) the amendments were not earlier presented because the Applicant believed in good faith that the cited prior art did not disclose the present invention as previously claimed;

(c) the amendments of claims 1, 12, 16, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 should not entail any further search by the Examiner since no new features are being added or no new issues are being raised; and

(d) the amendments do not significantly alter the scope of the claims and place the application at least into a better form for appeal. No new features or new issues are being raised; and/or

The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures sets forth in §714.12 that "[a]ny amendment that would place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be entered." ( Underlining added for emphasis) Moreover, §714.13 sets forth that "[t]he Proposed Amendment should be given sufficient consideration to determine whether the claims are in condition for allowance and/or whether the issues on appeal are simplified." The Manual of Patent Examining Procedures further articulates that the reason for any non-entry should be explained expressly in the Advisory Action.

**CLAIM OBJECTION**

Claim 16 was objected to for an informality. Claim 16 has been amended to depend from claim 12. Thus, claim 16 is now submitted to be in acceptable form.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112:**

In the Office Action, at pages 2-3, numbered paragraphs 3-6, claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for the reasons set forth therein. This rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

In order to clarify the terms “special descriptor” and “reference logic”, the following terminology has been added to each independent claim (claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40):

“wherein the standard descriptor is a descriptor known on both a query side and a database side and one special descriptor is derived from at least two standard descriptors by the reference logic and/or one standard descriptor is derived from at least two special descriptors by the reference logic.”

The above amendments to the independent claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are submitted to render said claims definite. Since claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 depend from amended claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 are submitted to be definite for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be definite.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

In the Office Action, at pages 3-6, numbered paragraph 8, claims 1-2, 4-13, 15-22, 34, 36 and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325; hereafter, Brown). The reasons for the rejection are set forth in the Office Action and therefore not repeated. The rejection is traversed and reconsideration is requested.

It is respectfully submitted that Brown discloses using an alias table for translating one “Program Variable” into one “Database Column Name.” In addition, Brown also submits that the variable type can be adjusted. Thus, Brown only describes a one-to-one mapping of “Program Variable” into “Database Column name.”

In contrast, the present claimed invention recites a one-to-N and/or N-to-one mapping feature, whereby N can be greater than one. Thus, the amended independent claims have been amended to recite that one standard descriptor is derived from at least two standard descriptors by the reference logic and/or one standard descriptor is derived from at least two special descriptors by the reference logic. This mapping feature is shown in FIG. 1, and is supported by the description of FIG. 1 in the specification.

Thus, amended claims 1, 12, 34, 36, 38, 39 and 40 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325). Since claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 depend from amended claims 1 and 12, respectively, claims 2, 4-11, 13, and 15-22 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325) for at least the reasons that amended claims 1 and 12 are submitted to be allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brown et al. (USPN 6,397,325).

**CONCLUSION:**

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot, and further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited. At a minimum, this Amendment should be entered at least for purposes of Appeal as it either clarifies and/or narrows the issues for consideration by the Board.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited and possibly concluded by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss any such remaining issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 10, 2005

By: Darleen J. Stockley  
Darleen J. Stockley  
Registration No. 34,257

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501